

MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney
THOMAS H. PETERS, Chief Assistant City Attorney
ERIC BROWN, Dep. City Attorney (State Bar No. 170410)
Email: Eric.Brown@lacity.org
200 North Main Street, 6th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: 213.978.7508
Facsimile: 213.978.7011

**Attorneys for Defendant City of Los Angeles,
Lt. Andrew Mathis, Sgt. Hamer and Sgt. Richter**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CARL MITCHELL, MICHEAL
ESCOBEDO, SALVADOR ROQUE,
JUDY COLEMAN, as individuals; LOS
ANGELES CATHOLIC WORKER,
CANGRESS, as organizations,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal
entity; LT. ANDREW MATHIS, SGT.
HAMER and SGT. RICHTER, in their
individual and official capacities,

DEFENDANTS.

CASE NO. CV16-01750 SJO (JPRx)
[Assigned to the Honorable S. James
Otero, Courtroom 1]

**NINTH STIPULATION TO
CONTINUE HEARING DATE OF
THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES'
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF
ORDER**

[Submitted with proposed order]

Date: March 20, 2017

Time: 10 a.m.

Place: Courtroom 10C

STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME

It is hereby stipulated between Plaintiffs and the City of Los Angeles, Lt. Andrew Mathis, Sgt. Hamer and Sgt. Richter (collectively “the City”) as follows:

1. The City has filed a Motion for Clarification of the Court’s order of April 13, 2016 issuing a preliminary injunction. The motion was originally set for July 25, 2016.

2. Over the past several months, the City and Plaintiffs engaged in several mediation sessions on the City’s concerns underlying the motion on multiple dates beginning on May 9, 2016, before the Honorable Carla Woehrle. Progress was made in those sessions, and the parties agreed to continue the process.

3. Each of the parties has engaged in additional separate discussions with former Magistrate Judge Woehrle and have provided written responses to the issues under discussion. The discussions with former Magistrate Judge Woehrle are continuing. The parties are presently awaiting a written document from the judge, setting forth the parties’ respective positions on the remaining issues, after which the parties will see if some or all of those matters can be resolved.

4. Under the present schedule, Plaintiffs’ opposition to the motion is currently due February 27, 2017.

5. To avoid the necessity of Plaintiffs opposing the motion when the parties are still engaged in mediation, the parties request that the motion hearing date be continued.

6. In light of the schedule of Judge Woerhle, the parties believe another extension of the time for Plaintiffs’ to file their opposition would be appropriate and that the current hearing date should be continued from March 20, 2017 to allow the mediation discussions to continue.

1 7. The Plaintiffs and the City hereby stipulate, subject to Court approval,
2 to continue the hearing date of the motion for clarification to April 24, 2017, in order
3 to give the parties an opportunity to reach consensus on the issues underlying the
4 motion.

5
6 It is so stipulated.

7
8 Dated: February 27, 2017

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

9
10 By: /s/ Eric Brown
11 Eric Brown, Deputy City Attorney
12 Attorneys for Defendants

13 Dated: February 27, 2017

LAW OFFICE OF CAROL A. SOBEL

14
15 By: /s/ Carol A. Sobel
16 Carol A. Sobel
17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28